



POSUDEK VEDOUCÍHO DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE

Studijní obor: **Učitelství pro střední školy se specializacemi: Anglický jazyk a literatura - Dějepis**

Název práce: **The semantics of English nominal deverbal derivatives in -er**

Autorka práce: **Bc. Aneta Šmídová**

Vedoucí diplomové práce: **Mgr. Petr Kos, Ph.D.**

Oponentka diplomové práce: **Mgr. Jana Kozubíková Šandová, Ph.D.**

Quality of Research

1) Please rate the following statements about the thesis on a scale of 1 (insufficient) to 3 (excellent)

1. The topic of the thesis is suitable for the scope and well defined: 3
2. Sets clear goals or questions for research: 2
3. Delivers significant research findings: 2
4. Demonstrates conceptual clarity and accuracy: 1
5. Demonstrates a good understanding of the linguistic works discussed: 1
6. Demonstrates a good understanding of the critical field: 2
7. Engages with sufficient scholarship in a meaningful way: 1
8. Shows independent thinking and originality: 2

2) Comment briefly on the quality of the research presented in the thesis:

The novelty of the work consists in analysing deverbal nominatives in *-er* on a large sample of data drawn from a corpus. This has enabled the author to include instances of derivatives not discussed in available literature. Among the assets of the work is the quantification of the derivatives according to individual constructional schemas employed and according to individual semantic categories. This quantification allows the author to demonstrate the correlation between prototypicality of subtypes and the size of the corresponding paradigmatic series.

However, the work demonstrates a number of shortcomings. Firstly, the theoretical introduction of individual word-formation theories appears to lack a specific aim as the author does not sufficiently specify how this introduction contributes to the overall goal of the thesis. By the same token, the inclusion of Dokulil's onomasiological approach lacks a description of its justification since it appears to stand out from the other theories presented.

Secondly, some phenomena mentioned in the thesis are not sufficiently defined, and their impact on the categorization of the derivatives explained, for instance, prototypicality in Ryder's work or metonymy in Panther and Thornburg's work.

Also, for example, it is not clear on what bases we may assume that a particular set of instances constitutes a separate constructional schema.



Quality of Writing

1) Please rate the following statements about the thesis on a scale of 1 (insufficient) to 3 (excellent)

1. Has a clear and suitable structure: 2
2. Employs appropriate register and academic style: 2
3. Uses correct and relevant terminology: 2
4. Adheres to academic thesis guidelines, format and MLA style guide: 3
5. Written in correct and fluent English (both grammar and vocabulary): 2
6. Carefully edited with few typos or mistakes: 3

2) Comment briefly on the quality of the writing presented in the thesis:

The work is written adequate language in terms of formal aspects. However, it includes a number of imprecise/illogical linguistic formulations, such as *these words are derived from verbs and converted into nouns* (p. 9, conversion is a different word-formation process), *Marchand distinguishes deverbals and denominals as separate suffixes* (p. 13, deverbals and denominals are complex words, not suffixes), *the lexicon (dictionary of the language)* (p. 15, vocabulary rather than dictionary), *the various affixes are formed by distinct rules* (p. 16, words, not affixes, are formed by rules), etc.

At times, it is not clear from the formulation what the author means, as in *the processes differ according to the language, meaning that the conceptual base of the act of naming is language-independent* (p. 18).

Overall Review and Assessment

(short description of the thesis and its findings, what has been achieved, and areas for improvement)

The thesis analyses a large dataset of deverbal nominals in *-er* drawn from a corpus. On the basis of the resulting series of lexemes, it aims to draw existing constructional schemas that are instrumental in the formation of such derivatives.

As mentioned above, the thesis brings new findings in terms of the correlation between prototypicality of individual series of lexemes and its frequency of occurrence. Also, it has presented new series of lexemes so far ignored in literature.

Nevertheless, it remains a pity that the findings are not sufficiently highlighted in the conclusion and the resulting constructional schemas are not clearly presented.

Questions for Defence

(please provide two questions for the student to answer during their defence)

Could you please explain on what bases, within the category of agent, you assign the non-prototypical categories, such as animals and plants, their own constructional schemas and not, for instance, the category of devices as the notation of the schemas appears to be the same?



Práci doporučuji k obhajobě.

Navrhovaná klasifikace: **dobře**

26.5.2023

Datum

Podpis

* Numerical assessments are provided as a guideline for recommending the final grade following an indicative scale:

over 38 "výborně"

32-38 "velmi dobře"

28-32 "dobře"

below 28 points the work is in danger of failing.

The final grade will be determined by the committee following the thesis defence.